

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of September 15, 2010 is respectfully requested.

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugimoto et al. (JP 2002-008524). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 1 recites a plasma display panel comprising a front panel including a display electrode, a dielectric layer and a protective layer sequentially formed on a first glass substrate, and a back panel including an address electrode, a base dielectric layer, a barrier rib and a phosphor layer sequentially formed on a second glass substrate, with the front panel and the back panel being disposed so as to confront each other and being sealed at the outer walls so as to form an inner space between the protective layer of the front panel and the phosphor layer, barrier rib and base dielectric layer of the back panel.

The plasma display panel of claim 1 also includes *a first catalyst and a second catalyst provided on at least one of the barrier rib and the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space and react with a hydrocarbon existing in the inner space*. Further, claim 1 recites that the first catalyst is at least one of a catalyst which accelerates oxidization of the hydrocarbon and is selected from the group consisting of Pd, Pt, Rh, Co₃O₄, PdO, Cr₂O₃, Mn₂O₃, CoO, and NiO, and that *the second catalyst accelerates decomposition of the hydrocarbon and is selected from the group consisting of Co, Ti and Ni*.

Sugimoto discloses a plasma display panel which, as shown in Fig. 2, includes a back panel 12, a front panel 14, ribs 16 and a phosphor layer 24. Further, Sugimoto discloses that the ribs 16 are formed by baking a rib-precursor compact obtained by hardening a light-sensitive glass-ceramic paste. In this regard, Sugimoto discloses that the light-sensitive paste should preferably include an oxidation catalyst in order to reduce the temperature required for burning off the binder component when forming the rib.

However, it is first noted that Sugimoto does not disclose *a second catalyst which accelerates decomposition of the hydrocarbon and is selected from the group consisting of Co, Ti and Ni*, as required by independent claim 1. In particular, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Sugimoto discloses Ni as a second catalyst. However, Sugimoto only

discloses that the oxidation catalyst is composed of an oxide, salt or complex of Ni (see paragraph [0017] of the partial translation of Sugimoto which was submitted in the IDS filed on April 1, 2009), and does not disclose Ni (i.e., elemental nickel) as a second catalyst. Therefore, as Sugimoto only discloses that the oxidation catalyst is composed of an oxide, salt or complex of elements such as Ni, Sugimoto does not disclose a second catalyst which accelerates decomposition of the hydrocarbon and is selected from the group consisting of Co, Ti and Ni, as required by independent claim 1.

Further, Sugimoto does not disclose first and second catalysts *provided on at least one of the barrier rib and the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space*, as required by independent claim 1. In particular, it is first noted that claim 1 recites that the “inner space” is formed between the protective layer of the front panel and the phosphor layer, barrier rib and base dielectric layer of the back panel once the front and back panels are arranged to confront each other and are sealed at outer walls with a sealing member.

In this regard, Sugimoto discloses an oxidation catalyst provided in the light-sensitive paste used in forming the ribs. However, as shown in Fig. 2, Sugimoto discloses that the surfaces of the ribs 16 are covered by the phosphor layer 24, while the top surfaces of the ribs would be in contact with the lower surface of the substrate 10. In other words, in the assembled PDP of Sugimoto, no portions of the ribs 16 are exposed to the inner space, and therefore any catalyst contained in the ribs is also not exposed to the inner space. Thus, as Sugimoto only discloses a catalyst used in forming ribs which are not exposed to the inner space of the assembled PDP, Sugimoto does not disclose first and second catalysts provided on at least one of the barrier rib and the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space, as required by independent claim 1.

Accordingly, as Sugimoto does not disclose (1) a second catalyst which accelerates decomposition of the hydrocarbon and is selected from the group consisting of Co, Ti and Ni, and (2) that the first and second catalysts are provided on at least one of the barrier rib and the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space, as required by claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Sugimoto does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claim 13 which depends therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Further, it is noted that dependent claim 13 recites that the first catalyst and the second

catalyst are both provided on the barrier rib and on the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space and react with the hydrocarbon existing in the inner space. In this regard, and as discussed above, it is noted that Sugimoto only discloses an oxidation catalyst contained in the barrier rib, and does not disclose or suggest that the oxidation catalyst is contained in the phosphor layer. Accordingly, as Sugimoto only discloses that the oxidation catalyst is contained in the barrier rib, Sugimoto does not disclose that a first catalyst and a second catalyst are both provided on the barrier rib and on the phosphor layer so as to be exposed to the inner space and react with the hydrocarbon existing in the inner space, as required by dependent claim 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Sugimoto does not anticipate claim 13.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this response, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Morio FUJITANI

/Walter C. Pledger/

By 2010.12.15 16:35:38 -05'00'

Walter C. Pledger
Registration No. 55,540
Attorney for Applicant

WCP/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 15, 2010